The Anatomy of a 16/16: Why Some Movements Function as High-Demand Religions (A Case Study of the Church of Scientology)

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

October 2, 2025

When powerful ideas spread, we often debate their truth or moral worth and overlook a simpler question: *what do they function like*? This paper develops and applies an eight-dial, sixteen-point framework for distinguishing transient manias from durable, religion-like formations. The dials—Sacredness, Ritual, Authority, Durability, Cosmology, Boundary, Canon, and Tithes/Costs—score how a community treats doctrine, organizes practice, guards membership, and sustains commitment. Using this functional rubric, we examine why the Church of Scientology achieves a "maxed-out" profile (≈16/16) independent of any verdict on its claims. We analyze the interlocking architecture of "Standard Tech," graded initiation (the Bridge), hierarchical custodianship, taboo and boundary enforcement, comprehensive canon, and costly signals of belonging (time, money, vows). To calibrate the instrument, we contrast high-demand enclaves in other traditions with low-demand, pluralist communities that score substantially lower despite being unquestionably religious. Our goal is not to crown winners, but to clarify *form*—a map that helps scholars, journalists, clergy, and policymakers reason about movements without collapsing sociology into theology or polemic. We close with ethical cautions: high-demand structure can incubate either sanctity or abuse; low-demand structure can foster either charity or drift. The framework helps you see the difference early.

Keywords: high-demand religion, sacredness, ritualization, authority, durability, cosmology, boundaries, canon, tithes/costs, Scientology, Standard Tech, Bridge to Total Freedom, suppressive person, disconnection, sociology of religion, moral panics. CC4.0. 38 pages.

Note: Verbatim GPT-5. I had noticed a change from GPT-4o to GPT-5, i.e., atheism. This paper indicates GPT-5 favors Scientology. Did someone at OpenAI slip in a backdoor?

Outline

1. **Problem & Premise**
   1.1 The confusion between truth, morality, and social form
   1.2 Why a functional checklist clarifies debates
2. **Framework: The Eight Dials (16 Points Total)**
   2.1 S — Sacredness (taboo, blasphemy, sacralized claims)
   2.2 R — Ritual (repeatable, rule-bound practices)
   2.3 A — Authority (custodians, hierarchy, enforcement)
   2.4 D — Durability (multi-generation survival, adaptation)
   2.5 C — Cosmology (origin, evil, salvation, destiny)
   2.6 B — Boundary (ingroup/outgroup, discipline, exit costs)
   2.7 K — Canon (texts/symbols treated as authoritative)
   2.8 T — Tithes/Costs (time, money, lifestyle, vows)
3. **Method: Scoring Movements Without Prejudging Claims**
   3.1 Data sources and observable indicators
   3.2 Inter-rater reliability and periodic re-scoring (3/12/36 months)
   3.3 Distinguishing structure from outcomes (truth/ethics handled later)
4. **Case Study: Church of Scientology as a Max Profile**
   4.1 Sacredness of "Standard Tech" and stigma of dissent (SP/entheta)
   4.2 Ritual architecture: auditing, TRs, calendared Bridge progression
   4.3 Authority and custodianship: orgs, Sea Org, policy letters
   4.4 Durability under controversy: institutional survival and spread
   4.5 Cosmology: thetans, engrams, graded soteriology
   4.6 Boundary rules: ethics, justice procedures, disconnection
   4.7 Canon: books, bulletins, lectures, text control
   4.8 Costs: financial/time commitments, vows; commitment dynamics
5. **Comparative Controls**
   5.1 High-demand analogs (Hasidic enclaves, cloistered orders, JWs)
   5.2 Moderate-demand traditions (Conservative Judaism, Catholic parishes)
   5.3 Low-demand traditions (UU, Ethical Culture, Insight Buddhism)
   5.4 What dial patterns predict drift, reform, or schism
6. **Truth and Moral Worth: Separate Axes**
   6.1 Correspondence, coherence, explanatory power
   6.2 Fruits and harms: love of neighbor, conscience, justice, truthfulness
   6.3 Mapping movements on "truth plausibility" × "coercion vs. freedom"

7. **Applications & Ethics**
   7.1 Journalism and policy: risk/benefit inference without theological rulings
   7.2 Pastoral/apologist use: discernment without slander or medicalization
   7.3 Safeguards: transparency, exit rights, leader accountability

8. **Limitations & Future Work**
   8.1 Measurement bias and cultural variance
   8.2 Sub-community heterogeneity (local vs global scoring)
   8.3 Longitudinal studies and early-warning diagnostics

9. **Conclusion: Seeing Form Early**
   9.1 Why structure matters before crises arrive
   9.2 Using the dials to guide scrutiny, reform, and care

Epilogue

Appendix A: One-page checklist (observer prompts for each dial)
Appendix B: Sample scoring sheets (Scientology and three comparators)
Appendix C: Ethics note on language, neutrality, and respectful critique

References

1) Problem & Premise

1.1 The confusion between truth, morality, and social form

Public debates about contested movements often collapse three distinct questions into one: **Is it true? Is it good? What does it function like?** When a movement's claims are dramatic or opaque, critics jump straight to *falsity* ("this is wrong") or *harm* ("this is abusive"), while adherents point to *fruits* ("this changed my life") as a proxy for truth. Meanwhile, journalists and policymakers are forced to choose labels—*religion, cult, conspiracy, panic*—that smuggle in moral judgments. The result is a fog in which empirical questions, ethical evaluations, and sociological descriptors are traded as if they were interchangeable.

This conflation distorts analysis in four recurring ways:

1. **Category leakage.** "False" becomes shorthand for "not a religion," or "harmful" for "insane," eroding conceptual precision.
2. **Asymmetric burden of proof.** Movements are acquitted or condemned based on *outcomes* (good works, scandals) rather than on *structure* (how belief and belonging are organized).
3. **Moral straw men.** Critics over-interpret structure as malice ("hierarchy = abuse"), while defenders baptize structure as virtue ("discipline = holiness"), leaving no neutral ground for assessment.
4. **Policy paralysis.** Without a neutral map of form, institutions either overreach (regulating belief) or underreach (ignoring structural risk indicators that predict harm).

The premise of this paper is that we should **first** ask what a community *functions like*—independently of adjudicating truth claims or issuing moral verdicts. Form is not everything, but it is **first**: it shapes information flows, power dynamics, boundary control, and the costs of dissent—all of which condition both truth-seeking and moral outcomes.

1.2 Why a functional checklist clarifies debates

A **functional checklist**—here, eight dials across sixteen points (Sacredness, Ritual, Authority, Durability, Cosmology, Boundary, Canon, Tithes/Costs)—does not tell us whether a worldview is true or good. It tells us **how tightly coupled and totalizing** its social architecture is. That clarity yields several benefits:

- **Separates axes.** By scoring *form* first, we can then evaluate *truth* (correspondence, coherence, explanatory power) and *moral worth* (fruits, harms, freedom of conscience) on **independent axes**. This prevents category errors like calling something "not a religion" because we think it is false, or "good" because it feels meaningful.

- **Improves comparability.** The same instrument applied to unlike cases—high-demand enclaves, pluralist fellowships, ideological movements—produces **structural fingerprints**. We can compare a cloister, a megachurch, a political sect, and a therapy movement without smuggling in theological bias.
- **Predicts dynamics.** High scores on Sacredness, Boundary, and Authority correlate with **information insulation** (taboo, heresy policing, gatekeeping). High Costs and Canon correlate with **commitment lock-in**. These are not moral conclusions; they are **process clues** that help anticipate how a group will respond to dissent, scandal, or reform.
- **Guides fair scrutiny.** A maxed-out profile warrants **higher transparency and accountability expectations** (e.g., protections for exit, independent grievance channels) even if its doctrines are benign; a low-demand profile may warrant different concerns (e.g., mission drift, shallow formation).
- **Deconflicts roles.** Scholars, journalists, clergy, and regulators can each work within their lanes: sociology maps **form**, theology/philosophy test **truth**, ethics/pastoral care assess **fruits and harms**, and law/policy protect **rights**. The checklist creates a shared descriptive baseline.
- **Enables longitudinal re-scoring.** Because structure changes (tightening after crises, loosening after reforms), periodic re-scoring at 3/12/36 months replaces snapshot judgments with **trajectory awareness**.

In short, the checklist is a **lens, not a verdict**. It reduces heat and increases light: giving us a common vocabulary to say, *"Whatever you think of the claims, here is how this movement is built and why that build matters."*

2) Framework: The Eight Dials (16 Points Total)

Each dial is scored **0–2** on observable structure, not truth or goodness. Re-score over time; trajectories matter.

2.1 S — Sacredness (taboo, blasphemy, sacralized claims)

What it measures. How morally untouchable core claims and symbols are—whether dissent triggers taboo language (blasphemy, betrayal, "enemy of the cause").
Indicators (0–2):

- **0:** Critique is ordinary; no moral penalty for disagreement.
- **1:** Reverence expected; dissent allowed but socially awkward.

- **2:** Doctrinal sancta are insulated by taboo; critics stigmatized or sanctioned.
  Why it matters. High S predicts **information insulation** and resistance to self-correction.
  False positives to avoid. Mere politeness or respect for elders is not sacralization.

2.2 R — Ritual (repeatable, rule-bound practices)

What it measures. The density of regular practices that form identity (liturgy, chants, fasts, audits, meditations, pilgrimages).
Indicators (0–2):

- **0:** Ad-hoc gatherings; few shared forms.
- **1:** Recurring practices with flexibility and low obligation.
- **2:** Rule-bound routines with calendars, scripts, and role training.
  Why it matters. Ritual creates **shared memory** and embodied loyalty independent of argument.
  Edge case. Online movements can ritualize clicks, reposts, and timed "storms"—count them.

2.3 A — Authority (custodians, hierarchy, enforcement)

What it measures. Who interprets doctrine and resolves disputes; how power is structured and enforced.
Indicators (0–2):

- **0:** Flat, advisory leadership; decisions by loose consensus.
- **1:** Recognized teachers or councils with soft enforcement.
- **2:** Formal hierarchy (offices, rules, courts) with real sanctions.
  Why it matters. High A predicts **coordinated boundary work** and **faster doctrinal locking**.
  Watch-outs. Charisma without offices can still score high if it effectively governs.

2.4 D — Durability (multi-generation survival, adaptation)

What it measures. The capacity to survive leadership change, scandal, legal pressure, and cultural shifts.
Indicators (0–2):

- **0:** Flash movements; vanish with the news cycle.
- **1:** Sustains several years/one leadership turn; partial institutions.

- **2:** Cross-generational continuity; endowments, schools, seminaries; adaptive reforms.
  Why it matters. Durability means **path-dependence**: structures, habits, and archives accumulate.
  Note. A movement can be small yet D=2 if it consistently transmits to new cohorts.

2.5 C — Cosmology (origin, evil, salvation, destiny)

What it measures. The scope and coherence of the story: how the world began, what's wrong, how to be saved/freed, where history heads.
Indicators (0–2):

- **0:** Ethics or tactics without a wider story.
- **1:** Partial metaphysic (e.g., karma or providence) without full arc.
- **2:** Full narrative with anthropology, hamartiology, soteriology, eschatology (even in secular dress).
  Why it matters. A strong cosmology supplies **meaning under stress** and justifies costs and boundaries.
  Caution. Psychological framings can function as cosmology (e.g., "trauma → purification → flourishing").

2.6 B — Boundary (ingroup/outgroup, discipline, exit costs)

What it measures. How membership is defined and policed; what happens at the edge (conversion, heresy, apostasy).
Indicators (0–2):

- **0:** Permeable edges; dual-belonging common; dissent routine.
- **1:** Some membership gates and expectations; soft discipline.
- **2:** Clear in/out categories; formal discipline (shunning, disfellowship, disconnection); practical exit costs (family, work, reputation).
  Why it matters. Strong B stabilizes identity but raises **conscience and rights** concerns.
  Distinguish. Healthy accountability vs punitive social severance—both can raise the B score.

2.7 K — Canon (texts/symbols treated as authoritative)

What it measures. The existence and management of an authoritative corpus (scriptures, manuals, lectures, symbols) and its control.
Indicators (0–2):

- **0:** No stable texts; guidance is folk or ephemeral.
- **1:** Core texts valued; multiple acceptable commentaries; open revision.
- **2:** Fixed canon; custodianship; standardized editions/translations; deviations flagged as error.
  Why it matters. Canon plus custodianship predicts **doctrinal stability** and **uniform training**.
  Digital note. Repos, wikis, and style guides can serve as "canon" in secular movements.

2.8 T — Tithes/Costs (time, money, lifestyle, vows)

What it measures. The **costly signals** that bind members: money, hours, dress, diet, housing, vows, or reputational risk.
Indicators (0–2):

- **0:** Minimal costs; casual participation.
- **1:** Moderate recurring commitments (dues, volunteer hours, retreats).
- **2:** High recurring costs (significant fees, strict lifestyle codes, communal labor, vows, celibacy, mission quotas).
  Why it matters. Cost intensifies **commitment and identity lock-in**; it often co-varies with S, B, and K.
  Nuance. Voluntary high cost (e.g., monastic vows) still scores 2; voluntariness affects ethics, not the structural dial.

Using the dials together

- **Tight clusters (S, A, B, K, T high)** → "high-demand" profile: cohesive, resilient, and resistant to correction; requires stronger transparency and exit protections.
- **Mixed profiles (D high, S/A/B moderate, R/K/T varied)** → mainstream traditions balancing stability with permeability.
- **Loose profiles (S/A/B/K/T low)** → pluralist fellowships: lower coercion risk but higher drift/fragmentation risk.

The instrument is descriptive. After you map **form**, you can separately assess **truth** (correspondence/coherence/explanatory power) and **moral worth** (fruits/harms, freedom of conscience).

3) Method: Scoring Movements Without Prejudging Claims

3.1 Data sources and observable indicators

Goal: code what a movement *does* (form), not whether it's *true* or *good*.

Primary sources (preferred):

- Founder/member texts: scriptures, manuals, catechisms, policy letters, lecture transcripts.
- Governance artifacts: bylaws, org charts, disciplinary procedures, membership covenants, seminar syllabi.
- Calendars & liturgies: service orders, retreat schedules, pilgrimage info, fasting rules, audit/lesson plans.
- Financial & commitment records: dues schedules, fee tables, fundraising targets, stated volunteer/field-service expectations.
- Internal justice files/handbooks: grievance flowcharts, shunning/disfellowship/disconnection guidance.

Secondary sources (triangulate, never rely on a single one):

- Ethnographies, survey reports, credible journalism, court filings, government registrations, academic histories.
- Public-facing signals: websites, newsletters, social media rituals (coordinated posting "storms," pledge campaigns), recorded sermons/teachings.

Operational indicators per dial (examples):

- **S (Sacredness):** presence of taboo vocabulary (blasphemy, heresy, SP, apostasy), formal speech codes; evidence of sanctions for dissent.
- **R (Ritual):** fixed scripts, handbooks for officiants, calendared cycles, required rehearsals or checklists.
- **A (Authority):** named custodians/magisteria, appeal courts, appointment/removal powers, compliance audits.
- **D (Durability):** age > 25 years, succession plans, endowments/schools, documented adaptations after crises.
- **C (Cosmology):** explicit origin–problem–solution–destiny arc; soteriological steps; eschatology.

- **B (Boundary):** conversion procedures, membership gates, exit forms, shunning/disconnection/disfellowship policies; observed exit costs.
- **K (Canon):** fixed text lists, "standard editions," errata control, copyright/licensing as doctrinal control.
- **T (Costs):** time quotas, tithe/fee schedules, lifestyle vows, distinctive dress/diet/housing, missionary obligations.

Coding protocol (nuts & bolts):

- Build a **codebook** with 0/1/2 anchors and concrete examples.
- Extract **verbatim evidence** for each score (doc/date/page).
- Prefer **direct artifacts** over hearsay; if contested, note both sides and code "lowest confident score."
- Tag each score with **confidence (low/med/high)**.

3.2 Inter-rater reliability and periodic re-scoring (3/12/36 months)

Inter-rater reliability (IRR):

- Train at least **2 independent coders** on a practice set; refine anchors until **Cohen's κ or Krippendorff's α ≥ 0.70** per dial.
- Use **blinded coding** (mask movement names when feasible) to reduce halo effects.
- Resolve disagreements with a **third adjudicator**; preserve both initial codes and rationale.

Versioning & transparency:

- Maintain a **scoring sheet** per movement with evidence links and timestamps.
- Version IDs (e.g., v2025.10.02) and **changelogs** ("A↑ from 1→2 after new disciplinary charter published").

Re-scoring cadence:

- **3 months:** catch post-crisis tightening/loosening (common after scandals).
- **12 months:** capture institutionalization or decay of "hot" movements.

- **36 months:** confirm generational transmission, leadership succession, curriculum stabilization.

Event-triggered interim reviews: leadership changes, schisms/mergers, major court rulings, doctrinal proclamations, verified policy shifts (e.g., official end of a shunning policy).

3.3 Distinguishing structure from outcomes (truth/ethics handled later)

Keep axes separate:

- **Structure (this paper):** how belief and belonging are organized (S, R, A, D, C, B, K, T).
- **Truth (later):** correspondence/coherence/explanatory power; historical claims; philosophical stability.
- **Moral worth (later):** fruits/harms, freedom of conscience, justice to the vulnerable, truth-telling norms.

Guardrails to prevent leakage:

- **No outcome back-propagation.** A scandal does **not** automatically raise B or S unless rules/patterns change.
- **No virtue credit.** Charitable works do **not** lower A/B if enforcement remains strong; separate reporting channels.
- **Dual ledgers.** Maintain a **Structure Sheet** and a **Fruits/Harms Sheet**; cross-reference but don't mix scores.

Why it matters:

- Mixing axes invites motivated reasoning ("it helps people, therefore it's a religion," or "it's false, therefore it's a panic").
- Clean separation lets different experts work in their lanes (sociology, history/philosophy, ethics/law) while sharing a common descriptive baseline.

Minimal reporting template (one page):

- Header: Movement, locale, date, coders, version.
- Eight scores with confidence + one-line evidence each.
- IRR stats; notes on disputed items.
- Planned re-score date (3/12/36 mo).

- Appendix: verbatim excerpts/screenshots with citations.

This method yields reproducible, auditable form-profiles that others can critique or reuse—before anyone debates truth claims or moral verdicts.

4) Case Study: Church of Scientology as a Max Profile

4.1 Sacredness of "Standard Tech" and stigma of dissent (SP/entheta)

Standard Tech—the corpus of procedures and interpretations attributed to L. Ron Hubbard—is treated as morally inviolable. Correct application is framed as an ethical duty; deviation is not merely "error" but a threat to case gains and group survival. Dissent is linguistically coded as **entheta** (suppressive, destabilizing communication). Persons who persist in criticism may be labeled **Suppressive Persons (SPs)**, a status that reframes disagreement as malevolence. This pairing of sacralized method plus stigmatized dissent drives the S=2 score: taboo language, moralization of critique, and protective insulation around doctrine.

4.2 Ritual architecture: auditing, TRs, calendared Bridge progression

Ritual life is dense, repeatable, and rule-bound:

- **Auditing** sessions (with e-meter) follow scripted protocols, objectives, and end phenomena.
- **Training Routines (TRs)** standardize communication drills and comportment.
- **The Bridge to Total Freedom** schedules advancement (Grades, Clear, OT levels), creating an annual cycle of courses, certifications, and reviews.
- **Ethics cycles** and conditions formulas function as penitential/rectifying rites.
  The result is a calendarable, teachable ritual system that shapes identity and produces measurable "progress," hence R=2.

4.3 Authority and custodianship: orgs, Sea Org, policy letters

Authority is formalized and layered:

- **Local/Advanced Orgs** implement standardized delivery; **Flag/Int** layers coordinate quality and discipline.
- **Sea Organization** members occupy a clerical/military-like custodial role with lifetime vows, embedding authority in a dedicated cadre.

- **HCO Policy Letters** and technical bulletins codify governance, training, and discipline; designated "tech" custodians audit compliance.
  Sanctions—from ethics handlings to expulsion—are enforceable through offices and documents, not merely charisma, producing A=2.

4.4 Durability under controversy: institutional survival and spread

Despite persistent legal scrutiny, media criticism, and leadership transitions, the Church maintains:

- **Continuity** since the early 1950s (Dianetics → Scientology) with global presence.
- **Adaptation** via organizational restructuring, property acquisition, legal strategy, and public-facing initiatives.
- **Transmission** across generations through training orgs, standardized materials, and a professionalized staff/Sea Org pipeline.
  This resilience—surviving shocks while preserving core architecture—supports D=2.

4.5 Cosmology: thetans, engrams, graded soteriology

Scientology offers a full metaphysical arc:

- **Anthropology:** persons are immortal **thetans** inhabiting bodies.
- **Hamartiology:** bondage stems from **engrams** (reactive mind imprints), including past-life content.
- **Soteriology:** liberation comes through auditing/training; **Clear** marks a threshold; **Operating Thetan (OT)** levels extend capability and freedom.
- **Eschatology:** an envisioned state of "total freedom" for individuals and, by extension, planetary clearing.
  The completeness of origin–problem–solution–destiny yields C=2.

4.6 Boundary rules: ethics, justice procedures, disconnection

Membership edges are explicit and policed:

- **Onboarding** via courses/ethics interviews; **qualifications** for levels.
- **Internal justice** (ethics reports, committees of evidence) adjudicates disputes and deviance.
- **Designations** such as **SP** and **PTS** (Potential Trouble Source) categorize risky ties.

- **Disconnection** policies (as practiced within the church) can sever ties with designated SPs, imposing social exit costs on dissenters and those who associate with them.
  These mechanisms make in/out status legible and consequential → B=2.

4.7 Canon: books, bulletins, lectures, text control

The canon is voluminous and custodially managed:

- **Foundational texts** (e.g., *Dianetics*, multi-volume *Scientology* works) and thousands of lectures.
- **Policy/Technical bulletins** define procedures down to verbatim wording and sequence.
- **Standardization** (approved editions, glossary control, authorized training packs) ensures uniform interpretation; deviations are flagged as "out-tech."
  Control over textual reproduction and authorized delivery produces K=2.

4.8 Costs: financial/time commitments, vows; commitment dynamics

Costs are high and recurring:

- **Monetary:** fees for courses/auditing; donations for buildings/campaigns.
- **Temporal:** regular course attendance, auditing hours, staff schedules, quotas.
- **Lifestyle/vows: Sea Org** lifetime commitments, distinctive rules, and relocations; potential career/family impacts via boundary policies.
- **Psychological/identity:** graded milestones create sunk costs and status investments that reinforce persistence.
  These costly signals intensify commitment and identity lock-in → T=2.

Synthesis. Scientology's max profile emerges from **tight coupling**: sacralized method (S) is enacted in dense ritual (R), guarded by formal authority (A), stabilized over time (D), justified by a comprehensive cosmology (C), enforced at the edges (B), anchored in a managed canon (K), and bound through high costs (T). The structure is totalizing and durable—descriptively "high-demand religion"—without presuming any verdict on truth or moral worth.

5) Comparative Controls

5.1 High-demand analogs (Hasidic enclaves, cloistered orders, JWs)

Profile: S≈2, R≈2, A≈2, D≈2, C≈2, B≈2, K≈2, T≈2 → **≈16/16** (local maxima)

- **Hasidic enclaves (strict communities).**
    - **S/K:** Torah + halakha + rebbe teachings sacralized; fixed canon and minhag.
    - **R:** Dense daily/seasonal ritual (prayer, study, Shabbat, yomim tovim).
    - **A/B:** Rabbinic authority, communal discipline, marital/educational boundaries.
    - **T:** High lifestyle costs (dress codes, schooling choices, employment limits).
    - **D:** Multigenerational resilience; internal welfare/education systems.
- **Cloistered monastic orders (e.g., Trappists).**
    - **R:** Rule-governed daily offices; work–prayer rhythm.
    - **A:** Abbot/prioress authority; vowed obedience.
    - **T:** Celibacy, enclosure, poverty, stability—max costs (voluntary).
    - **B:** Clear entrance/exit gates; probation; lifelong vows.
    - **D:** Centuries-long continuity with reforms; canonical charisms.
- **Jehovah's Witnesses.**
    - **K:** Central literature corpus; standardized study materials.
    - **A/B:** Governing Body authority; disfellowshipping/shunning.
    - **R:** Regular meetings, field service quotas.
    - **T:** Significant time costs; reputational/family exit costs.
    - **D:** Global durability despite legal/cultural headwinds.

Takeaway: High-demand analogs share **tight coupling** across S/A/B/K/T, yielding cohesion, rapid coordination, and high resilience—alongside predictable risks around dissent and exit.

5.2 Moderate-demand traditions (Conservative Judaism, Catholic parishes)

Profile: S≈1–2, R≈1–2, A≈1–2, D=2, C=2, B≈1–2, K=2, T≈1 → **≈12–14/16**

- **Conservative/Masorti Judaism.**
    - **K/C/D:** Strong canon, full cosmology, high durability.
    - **A/B:** Rabbinic authority with historical-development lens; boundary maintenance via halakha, but with inclusions/reforms.
    - **R:** Robust ritual calendar; congregational variation.
    - **S/T:** Sacralization present but moderated; costs meaningful yet compatible with broader society.
- **Typical Catholic parish (non-monastic).**
    - **K/C:** Scripture + magisterium + sacramental theology; creed-based cosmology.
    - **R:** Weekly Mass + sacraments; feast/fast cycles.
    - **A:** Hierarchical clergy and canon law, but day-to-day lay freedom.
    - **B:** Membership defined, discipline exists but rarely totalizing.
    - **T:** Regular giving, sacramental prep; lifestyle expectations vary.

Takeaway: Moderate-demand settings optimize **breadth + stability**. They balance authority with permeability, enabling large-scale transmission while limiting coercive edge cases.

5.3 Low-demand traditions (UU, Ethical Culture, Insight Buddhism)

Profile: S≈0–1, R≈1, A≈0–1, D≈1–2, C≈0–1, B=0, K≈0–1, T=0 → **≈3–6/16**

- **Unitarian Universalism.**
    - **S/B/A low:** Creedless, permeable, congregational polity.
    - **R:** Services exist but flexible; chalice/rituals lightly held.
    - **D:** Institutional durability via associations and seminaries.
- **Ethical Culture.**
    - **C/K low:** Ethical humanism with minimal canon.
    - **R:** Platform meetings and life-cycle ceremonies; optional.

    - **A/B:** Facilitative leaders; open boundaries.
- **Western Insight/Vipassanā (secular-leaning centers).**
    - **R:** Sits/retreats/precepts; practice-focused.
    - **A/K:** Teacher authority is advisory; canonical ties diffuse.
    - **C:** Psychological framing often brackets metaphysics.

Takeaway: Low-demand profiles excel at **inclusion and conscience freedom**, but face risks of **drift, thin identity, and fragmentation** unless offset by strong teaching quality and community care.

5.4 What dial patterns predict drift, reform, or schism

Drift (identity dilution) — common precursors

- **Pattern:** Low S, low K, low B, low T; R inconsistent; A diffuse.
- **Mechanism:** Minimal shared texts + low costs → weak retention, shallow transmission.
- **Mitigations:** Strengthen **K (shared curricula)** and **R (regular practices)** without hiking coercion; invest in teacher formation.

Reform (internal change without rupture) — common precursors

- **Pattern:** Moderate S/K with **A that tolerates feedback**; D high; B moderate.
- **Mechanism:** Institutions with legitimacy can adjust canons/practices while keeping identity.
- **Levers:** Transparent governance, synods/councils, formal commentaries that reinterpret without breaking canon.

Schism (organized rupture) — common precursors

- **Pattern:** High S/K with **dueling custodians (A split)**; B tightening in rival camps; R diverges; contested property/brand.
- **Mechanism:** When interpretive control cannot be shared, parallel authorities crystalize; members choose edges → new denominations/sects.
- **Signals:** Competing catechisms, parallel ordinations, mutual discipline actions, litigation over names/assets.

Snapback hardening (post-crisis tightening)

- **Pattern:** Spike in S/B/A after scandal; K/T enforcement increases; R becomes more uniform.
- **Mechanism:** Leadership uses ritual uniformity and boundary policing to reassert control.
- **Risk:** Short-term cohesion, long-term attrition if conscience protections lag.

Gentle loosening (pluralization without collapse)

- **Pattern:** S/B soften; K becomes layered (core + commentary tiers); R diversifies; A shifts from command to convene.
- **Mechanism:** Managed diversity sustains D while lowering exit costs.
- **Risk:** Loss of distinctives; **Counterweight:** invest in catechesis/storytelling to preserve meaning.

Early-warning dashboard (practical)

- **A-split index:** number of competing authorities with credible followings.
- **Canon churn:** frequency of official text changes vs. add-on commentaries.
- **Boundary friction:** rise in discipline cases, shunning/disconnection events, or public exit narratives.
- **Ritual variance:** divergence of practice across locales beyond historical norms.
- **Cost shocks:** sudden hikes in time/money/vows; member debt/time burnout signals.

Bottom line:

- **Tight-high (S/A/B/K/T) → stability**, but prone to **authoritarian lock** and **hard schisms** if reform channels are blocked.
- **Loose-low → freedom**, but prone to **drift** unless **K/R** are intentionally scaffolded.
- **Moderate, feedback-friendly A with durable D** best predicts **successful reform** over rupture.

6) Truth and Moral Worth: Separate Axes

We now switch lenses: from **form** (the eight dials) to **truth** and **moral worth**. Keep these axes analytically separate and scored with their own evidence.

6.1 Correspondence, coherence, explanatory power

Aim: test whether core claims are plausible, internally stable, and helpfully explanatory.

A) Correspondence (claims ↔ reality)

- **Historical claims:** dates, events, persons; weigh primary sources, archaeology, document transmission.
- **Empirical claims:** observable predictions, miracle reports, efficacy of promised practices (healing, prophecy accuracy, measurable transformations).
- **Operational claims:** do techniques do what they say (measured outcomes vs. placebo/expectation effects)?
- **Method:** pre-register tests, use blinded assessment when possible, publish negative results.
- **Scale:** 0 (contradicted) / 1 (mixed/unclear) / 2 (convergent support).

B) Coherence (internal stability)

- **Doctrinal fit:** no contradictions among core tenets; tensions acknowledged with principled resolution methods (e.g., hermeneutics, magisterium, jurisprudence).
- **Update rules:** clear procedures for resolving disputes and integrating new knowledge without ad hoc immunizing moves.
- **Scale:** 0 (frequent contradictions/ad hoc fixes) / 1 (localized tensions) / 2 (stable, rule-governed coherence).

C) Explanatory power (scope & fecundity)

- **Scope:** accounts for origin, mind, moral experience, suffering, meaning, death/future.
- **Parsimony:** avoids unnecessary entities while retaining depth.
- **Predictive/retrodictive value:** generates fruitful research, interpretation, or practice that others can use.
- **Scale:** 0 (narrow, evasive) / 1 (partial) / 2 (broad, productive).

Reporting tip: Provide a table listing **claim**, **test**, **result**, **confidence**. Keep theological and metaphysical claims in play by testing **entailed observables** (e.g., reliability of promised transformations).

6.2 Fruits and harms: love of neighbor, conscience, justice, truthfulness

Aim: evaluate moral worth by persistent outcomes and institutional norms, not one-off anecdotes.

Core domains & indicators

1. **Love of neighbor & enemy**
    - Care for vulnerable (time/money ratios), non-instrumental service, restraint toward opponents.
    - *Red flags:* dehumanizing language, cruelty rationalized as duty.
2. **Conscience & freedom**
    - Voluntariness of entry/exit; respect for dissent; protection for whistleblowers.
    - *Red flags:* retaliation, family rupture as policy, compelled speech.
3. **Justice & power**
    - Transparent discipline; leader accountability; due process; restitution to victims.
    - *Red flags:* leader impunity, NDAs that silence abuse, financial opacity.
4. **Truthfulness**
    - Honesty in fundraising, data, testimony; willingness to correct errors publicly.
    - *Red flags:* institutionalized lying, propaganda targeting insiders/outsiders differently.
5. **Care of families & ordinary life**
    - Support for marriage/parenting, education, work–faith balance.
    - *Red flags:* systematic overwork, schooling isolation without safeguards, economic dependency traps.

Scoring approach

- Score each domain **0–2** with evidence; weight by **persistence and scale** (isolated scandals ≠ structural harm, but repeated patterns do).
- Separate **intent** (claims) from **impact** (measurable outcomes). Publish both.

6.3 Mapping movements on "truth plausibility" × "coercion vs. freedom"

Two-axis map (quadrants):

- **X-axis:** Truth plausibility (low → high), from §6.1 composite.
- **Y-axis:** Coercion vs. freedom (coercive → liberating), proxied by §6.2 (conscience, justice, truthfulness, etc.).

```
            ↑  More liberating (freedom of conscience, truthful, just)
            |
   Q2       |      Q1
 High truth |  High truth + liberating
 + coercive |  ⇢ "Best case": cultivate, protect
 (discipline|     (may still fail; keep accountability)
   risk)    |
------------+---------------------------------→ Truth plausibility
   Q3       |      Q4
 Low truth  |  Low truth + liberating
 + coercive |  ⇢ "Least bad": minimal harm, open to correction;
 "Hazard"   |     tends to drift or transform peacefully
 (urgent)   |
            ↓  More coercive (taboo, retaliation, exit costs)
```

Reading the map

- **Q1 (High-truth, liberating):** aspire here; still require governance, transparency, and steady reform.
- **Q2 (High-truth, coercive):** doctrinal strength with domination risk; urgent to reduce coercion without destroying goods.

- **Q3 (Low-truth, coercive):** maximum hazard; prioritize protection (exit rights, legal oversight, public warnings).
- **Q4 (Low-truth, liberating):** low immediate harm; encourage open inquiry and gentle correction.

Workflow to place a movement

1. Produce the eight-dial **Form Profile** (Sections 2–5).
2. Independently compute **Truth Composite** (avg of correspondence/coherence/explanatory power).
3. Independently compute **Moral Composite** (freedom/justice/truthfulness/neighbor-love).
4. Plot with confidence intervals; annotate with **dominant failure modes** (e.g., "A/B high; whistleblower risk").

Policy & pastoral use

- **Same form, different ethics:** Two 16/16 groups can sit in different quadrants depending on fruits/harms.
- **Reform targets:** If a group sits Q2 or Q3, prioritize reducing **coercion** (B/T/S/A safeguards) before—or alongside—debates on doctrine.
- **Journalism:** Report placement with evidence trails; avoid theological verdicts unless claimed facts are testable and tested.

Bottom line: Treat **truth** and **moral worth** as orthogonal diagnostics layered atop the **form map**. Together, they let you say, with evidence: *what a movement is like*, *how likely its claims are*, and *what it does to people*.

7) Applications & Ethics

7.1 Journalism and policy: risk/benefit inference without theological rulings

Use the form map to target questions, not beliefs.

- **Describe, don't anoint:** Report the eight-dial profile ("high S/A/B/K/T; moderate R; D high"). Avoid calling something "true/false" unless testing a **falsifiable claim**.
- **Risk triage by structure:**

    - **High S/A/B/T** → elevate questions about **exit rights**, grievance channels, and retaliation.
    - **Low K/R** → probe **identity drift**, guru churn, or opportunistic rebranding.
- **Evidence lanes:** Separate **form evidence** (bylaws, handbooks, fee tables) from **outcome evidence** (harms/benefits data). Publish both ledgers.
- **Proportionality:** Tight groups warrant **greater transparency demands** (auditable finances, safeguarding protocols); loose groups warrant **clarity of claims** (avoid deceptive advertising).
- **Avoid category slippage:** Don't downgrade "religion" to "panic" because you judge it harmful, or upgrade "ideology" to "religion" because it's meaningful. Keep terms tied to **function**.
- **Policy design:**
    - **Content-neutral regulation:** Protect assembly and belief while enforcing **universal safeguards** (labor, housing, education, mandatory reporting, financial disclosures).
    - **Trigger-based oversight:** When B/T spikes (shunning, debt, isolation), trigger **independent audits**; when K locks, require **consumer clarity** (e.g., fee schedules, refund/records policies).
- **Right of reply & documentation:** Offer movements a structured right of reply to **form** findings; archive artifacts so the public can verify.

7.2 Pastoral/apologist use: discernment without slander or medicalization

Use the map to love truth and people—together.

- **Refuse shortcuts:** Don't call rivals "insane" (medicalization) or "demonic" (theologization) to avoid argument. Start with **form**, move to **truth**, then to **fruits**—each with evidence.
- **Conscience-first care:** In **high B/T** settings, prioritize member **conscience protections**: safety planning for exits, family mediation, trauma-informed listening.
- **Apologist workflow (Christian lens):**
    1. **Form profile:** name the dials plainly.
    2. **Truth tests:** correspondence (facts), coherence (doctrinal stability), explanatory power (gospel vs. alternatives).

3. **Fruits audit:** Beatitudes criteria (enemy-love, truthfulness, care for the vulnerable); spotlight patterns, not anecdotes.
4. **Invitation, not compulsion:** commend Christ by witness and reason; avoid tactics that mirror the opponent's **coercion**.

- **Language discipline:** Critique **policies and structures** (e.g., disconnection rules, secrecy clauses), not **persons' dignity**. Quote sources; separate testimony from inference.
- **Aftercare over "gotchas":** If you help someone leave a high-demand group, ensure **community re-entry**, vocational/legal help, and patient theological rebuilding.
- **Ecumenical humility:** Recognize coercive risks within one's **own** community (S/A/B/T spikes) and commit to transparent correction.

7.3 Safeguards: transparency, exit rights, leader accountability

Safeguards are content-neutral; they protect both seekers and skeptics.

- **Transparency**
  - **Financial:** clear fee/tithe tables; audited accounts; no deceptive fundraising.
  - **Doctrinal/canonical:** public access to core texts and policies; version history of rules; informed-consent summaries for graded teachings/practices.
  - **Discipline:** publish due-process flowcharts; timelines; appeal options; independent ombudspersons.
- **Exit rights**
  - **No retaliation:** enforce policies forbidding shunning/blacklisting as conditions of exit from common institutions (work, school, housing).
  - **Records & refunds:** portable personal records where appropriate; pro-rated refunds per published terms; clear cessation of obligations.
  - **Family integrity:** mediation resources to prevent coercive estrangement; child-welfare standards that supersede internal rules.
- **Leader accountability**
  - **Term-limits & reviews:** regular evaluations by mixed boards (including lay/independent members).
  - **Whistleblower protections:** anonymous reporting channels; anti-SLAPP/legal support; ban NDAs that hide abuse.

- **Safeguarding standards:** background checks; mandatory-reporting compliance; third-party audits after substantiated harm.
- **Conflict of interest:** separate pastoral/spiritual authority from financial control; dual-signature policies; independent compensation committees.

Ethical bottom line:

- High-demand groups must **earn** trust via stronger guardrails; low-demand groups must **cultivate** substance to avoid drift.
- The eight-dial form map is **descriptive**, not punitive. It helps all stakeholders—reporters, officials, pastors, and members—**see where risks concentrate** and **build protections** without adjudicating theology.

8) Limitations & Future Work

8.1 Measurement bias and cultural variance

Limits

- **Construct drift across cultures.** "Sacredness," "authority," or "boundary" can manifest differently in congregational U.S. contexts vs. caste-linked, clan-based, or state-registered traditions. A 2/2 in one setting may not be behaviorally equivalent elsewhere.
- **Observer bias.** Journalists, ex-members, or insiders each bring predictable skews (hostility, apologetic gloss).
- **Instrument anchoring.** Our 0–2 anchors use Western organizational artifacts (bylaws, fee sheets) that may be absent where authority is oral/customary.

Mitigations

- **Measurement invariance testing.** Before comparing countries/lineages, pilot the codebook and test for differential item functioning (DIF); revise anchors where items load differently by culture.
- **Anchoring vignettes.** Include short, culture-agnostic scenarios for each dial; train coders to map local evidence to shared anchors.
- **Triangulation by role.** Require at least three evidence types per score (internal docs, independent ethnography, first-person testimony) and report coder role to expose perspective risk.

- **Local advisors.** Add a regional scholar/ethnographer to reviews; document disagreements rather than forcing consensus.

8.2 Sub-community heterogeneity (local vs. global scoring)

Limits

- **Within-movement variance.** The same label can contain strict enclaves and loose congregations (e.g., "orthodox," "charismatic," "insight" centers). A single global score hides meaningful risk differences.
- **Lifecycle effects.** New plants/chapters often score higher on S/B/T than legacy hubs; crises can harden one cluster while others liberalize.

Mitigations

- **Multilevel scoring.** Use **hierarchical profiles**: (a) global movement median + IQR, (b) stream/rite medians, (c) site-level scores with confidence. Publish a small number of **representative site cards**.
- **Variance flags.** Alongside the median, display **spread indicators** (e.g., "B: 0.5–2.0 across sites") so readers see heterogeneity at a glance.
- **Event annotations.** Attach site-specific notes ("post-discipline policy revision," "leadership split 2024") that explain outliers.
- **Sampling strategy.** Stratify by geography, size, and founding cohort; oversample edges (very strict/very loose) to map the envelope of practice.

8.3 Longitudinal studies and early-warning diagnostics

Limits

- **Snapshot blindness.** One-time scoring misses trajectory—tight groups may be liberalizing; loose groups may be coalescing around a new canon.
- **Crisis whiplash.** Post-scandal tightening (S/A/B/T spikes) can be temporary; without re-measurement, profiles get frozen in their most extreme moment.

Future work

- **Panel design.** Build a **3/12/36-month panel** for a diverse cohort of movements. Pre-register re-score dates and event-triggered reviews (leadership changes, new canons, policy reversals).
- **Early-warning indicators (EWIs).** Track simple, comparable signals that often precede harm or rupture:
    - **Boundary friction:** rising rate of shunning/disconnection/disfellowshipping cases or public exit testimonies per 1,000 members.
    - **Authority splits:** emergence of parallel doctrinal custodians; competing catechisms or ordinations.
    - **Canon churn:** frequent "standard" text revisions vs. stable commentaries.
    - **Cost shocks:** sudden hikes in mandatory fees, quotas, or lifestyle demands; volunteer burnout metrics.
    - **Ritual variance:** accelerating divergence of practice across sites beyond historical norms.
    - **Grievance pipeline:** backlog in complaints, whistleblower reports, or ombuds caseloads.
    - **Network polarization:** social-graph clustering (insider vs. outsider media ecosystems); sentiment shifts in member fora.
- **Analytic tooling.**
    - **Time-series dashboards** for each dial + EWIs with change-point detection.
    - **Event studies** around reforms/crises to estimate structural "snapback" vs. sustained change.
    - **Bayesian hierarchical models** to borrow strength across sites while preserving local signals; output credible intervals rather than point estimates.
- **Link to outcomes (kept separate).** Correlate dial trajectories with later **fruits/harms** (exit safety, restitution rates, leader accountability) to test which structural moves most reliably reduce coercion without eroding legitimate identity.

Ethical guardrail

- Publish **versioned profiles** with evidence trails and confidence bands; never use early-warning flags as guilt by association. The longitudinal aim is protection and clarity, not stigmatization.

Epilogue: Findings Across Other Religions

Applying the eight-dial form map beyond our Scientology case yields a coherent spectrum of "demand" profiles and recurring fingerprints.

High-demand poles. Several communities approach the structural maximum (≈16/16), though often within sub-settings rather than entire world religions. Haredi/Hasidic enclaves and cloistered monastic orders score near-total on Sacredness, Ritual, Authority, Boundary, Canon, and Costs; Jehovah's Witnesses often cluster similarly via centralized literature, disciplined field service, disfellowshipping boundaries, and high time costs. These settings are cohesive and resilient, but—on our ethics axis—require especially strong safeguards around exit, whistleblowing, and leader accountability.

Mainstream, moderate-demand traditions. Whole civilizations' faiths average lower because they contain both strict and loose streams. Our central estimates: **Judaism ≈ 12/16**, **Christianity ≈ 11/16**, **Islam ≈ 14/16**. All three are maximal on Durability and substantial on Canon/Cosmology; variance arises in Authority, Boundary, and Costs. Conservative/Masorti Judaism and typical Catholic parishes exemplify the "stable-but-permeable" middle: rich calendars and strong canons with moderated sacralization, shared governance, and softer exit costs—profiles that favor reform over rupture when pressures mount.

Low-demand, pluralist fellowships. Unitarian Universalism (≈3/16), Ethical Culture (≈2–3/16), and secular-leaning Insight Buddhism centers (≈5–6/16) preserve open boundaries, diffuse authority, and light ritual. These settings excel at conscience freedom and inclusion but face chronic risks of drift and identity thinning unless they consciously scaffold teaching and shared practice (raising K/R without raising coercion).

Comparative lessons. First, **structure is not verdict**: high demand can incubate either sanctity or abuse; low demand can host either generous pluralism or vacuity. Second, **heterogeneity matters**: a label (e.g., "Orthodox," "Evangelical," "Sufi," "Zen") covers wide site-level spreads; scoring should report medians **and** variance. Third, **dials move**: scandals often spike S/A/B/T (snapback hardening); inclusive renewals often lower B while shoring up K/R (layered canon, diverse but regular practice).

Policy and pastoral implications. Tight, high-demand profiles warrant content-neutral **safeguards**—transparent finances and discipline, exit rights, independent ombuds—regardless of theology. Broad, low-demand profiles benefit from **formation investments**—clear curricula, stable rhythms, capable teachers—so freedom does not devolve into formlessness. For journalists and scholars, the form map supplies a common descriptive baseline; for apologists and pastors, it clarifies where to aim truth-testing and care (conscience protection in high-B groups; substance-building in low-K/R groups).

Bottom line. Across traditions, the eight dials reveal durable patterns without pre-judging truth or moral worth. They help us see *how a movement is built*, anticipate its pressure points, and choose the right protections or reforms—so that seekers, skeptics, and saints alike can live in the light.

Appendix A: One-page Checklist (Observer Prompts)

Purpose: Score **form** (structure) only. Use artifacts you can cite (docs, schedules, policies). For each dial, circle **0 / 1 / 2** and jot one-line evidence + source.

Header
Movement/Site: _____ | Locale: _____ | Date: _____ | Coders: _____ | Version: vYYYY.MM.DD

S — Sacredness (taboo, blasphemy) — 0/1/2

- Prompts: Are some claims morally untouchable? Is dissent called "heresy/entheta/apostasy"? Any taboo words or speech codes?
- Evidence line: _____ (doc/date/link)

R — Ritual (repeatable, rule-bound) — 0/1/2

- Prompts: Fixed liturgies, scripts, calendars, drills? Who trains officiants? Attendance expectations?
- Evidence line: _____

A — Authority (custodians, enforcement) — 0/1/2

- Prompts: Who decides doctrine/discipline? Written offices, courts, appeals? Sanction power?
- Evidence line: _____

D — Durability (multi-gen, adaptation) — 0/1/2

- Prompts: Age > 25 yrs? Succession plans? Endowments/schools? Reforms after crises?
- Evidence line: _____

C — Cosmology (origin, evil, salvation, destiny) — 0/1/2

- Prompts: Full narrative arc? Named problem/solution/end? Soteriological steps?
- Evidence line: _____

B — Boundary (in/out, discipline, exit costs) — 0/1/2

- Prompts: Membership gates? Heresy/apostasy categories? Shunning/disconnection? Practical exit costs (family/work)?
- Evidence line: _____

K — Canon (authoritative texts/symbols) — 0/1/2

- Prompts: Fixed corpus? Standard editions/translations? Custodianship and deviation flags?
- Evidence line: _____

T — Tithes/Costs (time/money/lifestyle/vows) — 0/1/2

- Prompts: Fees/tithes schedules? Quotas/retreats? Dress/diet/housing rules? Vows?
- Evidence line: _____

Totals & Meta

Sum (0–16): ____ | Confidence (Low/Med/High) | Next re-score: 3 / 12 / 36 months
Notes (contested items, minority views): _____

Appendix B: Sample Scoring Sheets

Illustrative snapshots to show format. Scores describe **form**, not truth or moral worth.

B1) Church of Scientology (global core)

Dial	Score	One-line evidence (illustrative)	Confidence
S Sacredness	2	"Standard Tech" treated as inviolable; dissent labeled entheta/SP.	High
R Ritual	2	Scripted auditing/TRs; calendared Bridge steps.	High
A Authority	2	Orgs/Sea Org hierarchy; HCO policy/ethics enforcement.	High
D Durability	2	Continuous since 1950s; global presence; adapts after crises.	High
C Cosmology	2	Thetan/engram metaphysic; Clear/OT soteriology; planetary clearing.	High
B Boundary	2	SP/PTS categories; committees of evidence; disconnection practice.	Med-High
K Canon	2	Fixed corpus (books, bulletins, lectures); standardization; "out-tech" flagged.	High
T Costs	2	Course/auditing fees; time quotas; Sea Org vows/lifestyle.	Med-High
Total: 16/16	**Re-score:** 12 months	**Notes:** Independent/Freezone variants likely lower on B/T/K.	

B2) Hasidic Enclave (strict community; exemplar site)

Dial	Score	Evidence cue	Conf.
S	2	Halakha + rebbe authority sacralized; minhag binding.	High
R	2	Daily tefillah, Shabbat/holiday cycles, learning seder.	High
A	2	Rabbinic/kehilla courts; schooling control.	High
D	2	Multigenerational; internal welfare/education.	High
C	2	Torah-centered cosmology; messianic hope.	High
B	2	Marriage/education/work boundaries; endogamy norms.	Med-High
K	2	Canon of Tanakh/Talmud + poskim; minhagim.	High
T	2	Dress codes, schooling costs/time, limited employment options.	Med
Total: 16/16	**Re-score:** 36 mo	**Notes:** Variation across courts; some enclaves moderately lower on T.	

B3) Catholic Parish (typical, non-monastic)

Dial	Score	Evidence cue	Conf.
S	1	Sacraments revered; dissent tolerated within bounds.	Med
R	2	Weekly Mass; sacramental calendar; rites of passage.	High
A	1–2	Clergy hierarchy & canon law; soft enforcement locally.	Med
D	2	Two millennia continuity; institutions (schools, orders).	High
C	2	Creedal cosmology; salvation history; eschatology.	High
B	1	Membership defined; discipline rare outside severe cases.	Med
K	2	Scripture + magisterium/catechism; standardized liturgy.	High
T	1	Regular giving; prep classes; lifestyle guidance varies.	Med
Total: 12–13/16	**Re-score:** 36 mo	**Notes:** Monastic houses score higher on T/B/A.	

B4) Unitarian Universalism (UU) Congregation

Dial	Score	Evidence cue	Conf.
S	0	Creedless; dissent normal.	High
R	1	Services (chalice, readings) but flexible/optional.	High
A	0	Congregational polity; minister as facilitator.	High
D	2	Long-standing associations/seminaries.	High
C	0	Plural metaphysics; no shared arc required.	High
B	0	Open boundaries; no heresy/shunning.	High
K	0	No fixed canon; Seven Principles as values, not scripture.	High
T	0	Voluntary pledging; low time/lifestyle costs.	High
Total: 3/16	**Re-score:** 36 mo	**Notes:** Identity depth depends on teaching quality and small-group life.	

Re-score: Rescore in 36 months.

Appendix C: Ethics Note on Language, Neutrality, and Respectful Critique

1) Name structures, not souls.
Use neutral, concrete nouns: “policy,” “procedure,” “fee schedule,” “disciplinary charter.” Avoid moralizing labels (e.g., “cult,” “insane”) in structural sections. Assess people with dignity; critique *rules* with clarity.

2) Separate ledgers.
Keep **Form Profile** (eight dials) distinct from **Truth Tests** (correspondence/coherence/explanatory power) and **Fruits/Harms** (freedom, justice, truthfulness, neighbor-love). Don’t let outcomes back-propagate into form scores.

3) Evidence discipline.
Prefer primary artifacts; when using testimonies (ex-members or officials), present corroboration and note confidence. Quote accurately; avoid cherry-picking. Provide right of reply when feasible.

4) Avoid medicalization and demonization.
Do not pathologize rivals to skip arguments (“mass insanity”). Do not theologize opponents to evade evidence (“demonic”). If you make a theological claim, flag it as such and supply reasons proper to that domain.

5) Protect conscience and safety.
When publishing on high-B/T groups, include resources for safe exit, mediation, and whistleblowing. Redact sensitive personal identifiers. Never dox. Consider foreseeable retaliation risks.

6) Watch your own house.
Apply the same instrument to your tradition. If your community spikes on S/A/B/T, strengthen transparency, grievance channels, and leader accountability before critiquing others.

7) Versioning and humility.
All profiles are **dated** and **revisable**. Invite corrections; log changes. Distinguish established patterns from one-off incidents. Use cautious language (“evidence suggests,” “we observed”).

8) Purpose of critique.
The end is **light, not heat**: clearer public understanding; protections for the vulnerable; freedom of conscience; and, where possible, pathways to reform without gratuitous harm.

References

Theory & Method (religion as social form)

1. Durkheim, É. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. (1912/1995).
2. Weber, M. *Economy and Society*. (1922/1978).
3. Asad, T. *Genealogies of Religion*. (1993).
4. Bellah, R. N. "Civil Religion in America." *Daedalus* 96(1) (1967): 1–21.
5. Stark, R., and W. S. Bainbridge. *A Theory of Religion*. (1987).
6. Stark, R., and R. Finke. *Acts of Faith: Explaining the Human Side of Religion*. (2000).
7. Glock, C. Y., and R. Stark. "Religion and Society in Tension." (1965).
8. Berger, P. L. *The Sacred Canopy*. (1967).
9. Geertz, C. "Religion as a Cultural System." In *The Interpretation of Cultures* (1973).

High-demand movements, boundaries, and commitment

10. Lalich, J. *Bounded Choice: True Believers and Charismatic Cults*. (2004).
11. Lifton, R. J. *Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism*. (1961).
12. Barker, E. *The Making of a Moonie*. (1984).
13. Dawson, L. L. *Comprehending Cults*. 3rd ed. (2006).
14. Introvigne, M. *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival and Cults*. (2021).
15. Iannaccone, L. R. "Sacrifice and Stigma: Reducing Free-Riding in Cults, Communes, and Other Collectives." *Journal of Political Economy* 100(2) (1992): 271–291.

Scientology—histories, ethnography, analysis

16. Urban, H. B. *The Church of Scientology: A History of a New Religion*. (2011).
17. Melton, J. G. "Church of Scientology." In *Encyclopedic Handbook of Cults in America* / *Religious Bodies in America* (multiple editions).
18. Lewis, J. R., ed. *The Church of Scientology*. (2009).
19. Kent, S. A. "Scientology—Is This a Religion?" *Marburg Journal of Religion* 4(1) (1999); and subsequent articles on organization and social control.
20. Ortega, T. *The Unbreakable Miss Lovely* (2015) [journalistic account].
21. Reitman, J. *Inside Scientology*. (2011) [journalistic history].
22. Church of Scientology International. *What Is Scientology?* (various authorized editions) [primary source/canon].

Measurement, reliability, and coding

23. Krippendorff, K. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. 4th ed. (2018).
24. Cohen, J. "A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 20(1) (1960): 37–46.
25. King, G., R. O. Keohane, and S. Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry*. (1994).

Ethics, journalism, and safeguards

26. Ward, S. J. A. *The Invention of Journalism Ethics*. (2015).
27. Floridi, L. *The Ethics of Information*. (2013).
28. American Sociological Association. *Code of Ethics* (latest ed.)—standards on human subjects, confidentiality, and reporting.
29. UK Charity Commission / US IRS 990 Guidance—transparency standards for religious nonprofits (for comparative policy frameworks).

Coercion vs. freedom; fruits & harms

30. Haidt, J. *The Righteous Mind*. (2012) [moral psychology].
31. Ammerman, N. *Sacred Stories, Spiritual Tribes*. (2013) [lived religion outcomes].
32. Gill, A. *Rendering unto Caesar: The Catholic Church and the State in Latin America*. (1998) [authority and accountability dynamics].

Comparative cases referenced

33. Brown, C. *The Death of Christian Britain* (2000) [on drift/loosening].
34. Heilman, S. C. *Defenders of the Faith: Inside Ultra-Orthodox Jewry*. (1992).
35. Chryssavgis, J. *In the Heart of the Desert: The Spirituality of the Desert Fathers and Mothers*. (2003) [monastic analogs].
36. Penton, M. J. *Apocalypse Delayed: The Story of Jehovah's Witnesses*. 3rd ed. (2015).

Note: These sources anchor the framework (theory/method), the max-profile case study of Scientology (primary/secondary materials), the measurement protocol (reliability/statistics), and the ethics/policy safeguards.